

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17 and 20 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 12, and 17 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Formal Matters

Interview Summary Under 37 C.F.R. §1.133

A telephonic interview occurred between the undersigned, Jodi Hartman, and Examiners Arshad and Kincaid on October 21, 2004. The interview covered the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 12 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 5,684,969 to Ishida (hereinafter "Ishida") and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 17 as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of United States Patent No. 6,335,743 to Owings (hereinafter "Owings"). The Examiners indicated that the rejections of claims 1, 9, 12, and 17 were not being withdrawn at that time, but the Examiners agreed that proposed claim language would overcome the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 12 and the §103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 17. However, the Examiners stated that further consideration and search would be needed if the proposed amendments were made.

II. Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4-7, 12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ishida. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method of resizing a graphical user interface of a computer software application, the graphical user interface having at least one graphical user interface element disposed thereon, comprises determining whether the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than a minimum size for the graphical user interface, and if the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than the minimum size, then altering the size of the graphical user interface to the minimum size. Similarly, as

amended, claim 12 recites that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer resize a graphical user interface of a computer software application, the graphical user interface having at least one graphical user interface element disposed thereon performs the step of determining whether the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than a minimum size for the graphical user interface, and if the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than the minimum size, then altering the size of the graphical user interface to the minimum size.

Ishida does not teach or suggest a method of resizing a graphical user interface of a computer software application or a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer resize a graphical user interface of a computer software application as recited by claims 1 and 12, respectively. On the contrary, Ishida teaches a method of altering the display of node data including receiving a display rule entered by a user, and if the display rule selected by the user is lower than the lower display levels, then displaying nothing. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 or the computer readable medium recited by claim 12 because Ishida fails to teach or suggest determining whether the display rule entered by the user is less than the lower display levels, and if so, then altering the size of the display of node data to the lower display levels. Instead, Ishida teaches that if the display rule selected by the user is lower than the lower display levels, then nothing is displayed.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 12 are allowable over Ishida. Since claims 4-7 and 15-16 depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively, and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishida does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 4-7 and 15-16 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Ishida in View of Owings

Claims 8-9, 11, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Owings. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A description of amended claim 1 can be relied upon above. For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Ishida. Since claim 8 depends from claim 1 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Ishida and Owings cannot make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claim 8 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 9 recites that a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon, comprises determining whether the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than a minimum size for the graphical user interface, and if the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than the minimum size, then altering the size of the graphical user interface to the minimum size.

Ishida does not teach or suggest a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 9. In contrast, Ishida teaches a method of altering the display of node data including receiving a display rule entered by a user, and if the display rule selected by the user is lower than the lower display levels, then displaying nothing. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 9 because Ishida fails to teach or suggest determining whether the display rule entered by the user is less than the lower display levels, and if so, then altering the size of the display of node data to the lower display levels. Instead, Ishida teaches that if the display rule selected by the user is lower than the lower display levels, then nothing is displayed.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Owings to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies in the teaching of Ishida. However, like Ishida, Owings does not teach or suggest a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 9. To the contrary, Owings teaches a method for providing a window capable of being resized including determining if the window has been resized, and if the window has been resized, then moving the controls if necessary. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 9 because Owings fails to teach or suggest determining whether the selected size of the window is less than a minimum size for the window, and if the selected size of the window is less than the minimum size, then altering the size of the window to the minimum size.

For at least these reasons, claim 9 is allowable over the combined teaching of Ishida and Owings. Since claim 11 depends from claim 9 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Ishida and Owings does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claim 11 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 17 recites that a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon, comprises a dialog manager module operative to determine whether the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than a minimum size for the graphical user interface, and if the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than the minimum size, then alter the size of the graphical user interface to the minimum size.

Ishida does not teach or suggest a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 17. On the contrary, Ishida teaches an information management system for altering the display of node data operative to receive a display rule entered by a user, and if the display rule selected by the user is lower than the lower display levels, then to display nothing. This is not analogous to the system recited by claim 17 because Ishida fails to teach or suggest that the information management system is operative to determine whether the display rule entered by the user is less than the lower display levels, and if so, then to alter the size of the display of node data to the lower display levels. Instead, Ishida teaches that if the display rule entered by the user is less than the lower display levels, then nothing is displayed.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Owings to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies in the teaching of Ishida. However, like Ishida, Owings does not teach or suggest a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 17. In contrast, Owings teaches a system for providing a window capable of being resized including a resize layout manager operative to move controls within a window, if necessary, when the window is resized. This is not analogous to the system recited by claim 17 because Owings fails to teach or suggest that the resize layout manager is operative to determine whether the selected size of the window is less than a minimum size for the window, and if the selected size of the window is less than the minimum size, then to alter the size of the window to the minimum size.

For at least these reasons, claim 17 is allowable over the combined teaching of Ishida and Owings. Since claim 20 depends from claim 17 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Ishida and Owings does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claim 20 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Ishida in View of Owings and Thomson

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Owings and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,682,487 to Thomson (hereinafter "Thomson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A description of amended independent claim 9 can be relied upon above. For at least the reasons given above, claim 9 is allowable over the combined teaching of Ishida and Owing. Since claim 10 depends from claim 9 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Ishida, Owings, and Thomson does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claim 10 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1, 4-12, 15-17 and 20 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the final Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1, 4-12, 15-17 and 20 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5042.



Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leonard J. Hope". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Leonard J. Hope
Reg. No. 44,774